

these obscenities? It is because most of the victims of landmines are neither heard nor seen.

Mr President, I want to also speak briefly about another issue that will be debated in Vienna, blinding laser weapons.

In recent years, military forces have come to rely on lasers for range finding, target designation and other modern technology. These technologies have helped to increase the accuracy and effectiveness of U.S. weapons, and are widely accepted as legitimate uses in warfare. However, as the technology has advanced, various governments have begun to move from these non-weapon laser systems to the development of tactical laser weapons that are either intended or have the potential to destroy eyesight. Such laser weapons now exist in prototype form, and some are small enough to be mounted on a rifle.

A recent report identified 10 different U.S. laser weapon systems, 5 of which have apparently been fielded in prototype form. The Pentagon has acknowledged that two of the systems were deployed, but not used, in the Gulf war, and that one system was deployed, but not used, in Somalia. Other governments that have been mentioned in the press as developing blinding laser weapons include China, Russia, other former Soviet republics, France, the United Kingdom, Germany and Israel. China attempted to market its ZM-87, a portable laser weapon system, at an arms exhibition this spring. Its promotional literature openly states that one of the weapon's main purposes is to injure eyesight.

Alarmed by the obvious potential for widespread abuse by terrorists, rogue states, insurgent groups and common criminals if antipersonnel laser weapons are developed and allowed to proliferate, several years ago the international committee of the Red Cross initiated a campaign against battlefield laser weapons. This led to a Swedish proposal to add a protocol to the convention to prohibit the use of laser weapons for the purpose of causing permanent blindness as a method of warfare. Over 20 governments including many of our closest allies, as well as the European Parliament and the Organization of African Unity, have expressed support for such a protocol.

The possibility of hundreds or thousands of American servicemen and women returning from combat to face the rest of their lives without eyesight is sufficiently horrifying that I sought the Pentagon's opinion on the Swedish proposal. Although the Pentagon concedes that there is no military requirement for weapons that are used to destroy eyesight, I found the Pentagon strongly opposed to the Swedish proposal for several somewhat contradictory reasons:

I was told that a prohibition is unnecessary since there is no plan to develop blinding weapons. At the same time, I was told that they are easy to develop and indeed already exist.

I was told that there is no point in investing in such weapons since they are ineffective in inclement weather and thus unlikely to receive widespread use.

I was told that a prohibition would not prevent their development or use by civilians; that blinding is preferable to death; that a prohibition would be difficult to enforce because of the legitimate uses of lasers in warfare and, even worse, that it would deter legitimate uses; and that negotiation of such a protocol would divert attention from the more immediate and pressing issue of landmines.

These arguments are unpersuasive. The Pentagon maintains that its laser weapons systems are intended not to blind, but to disrupt enemy optical and electro-optical battlefield surveillance systems. The Pentagon has also conceded, however, that in some circumstances the laser weapon performs its antisensor function by damaging the eyesight of the enemy user. A laser weapon beam directed at a simple optic such as a binocular or gunner's sight does not destroy the optical lens, but instead magnifies and shoots back into the human eye, causing damage and probable permanent blindness. The most advanced U.S. laser weapon system, the Laser Countermeasure System [LCMS], which is mounted on an M-16 rifle, reportedly fires a beam powerful enough to destroy a human retina from a distance of 3,000 feet.

The fact that a prohibition would not directly apply to civilians is hardly a reason not to limit their use as a method of warfare, particularly since a prohibition would certainly inhibit their development and use by terrorists and common criminals. Blindness may be preferable to death, but blindness is permanent and weapons used to blind would be used in combination with, not instead of, other deadly weapons.

As for the Pentagon's argument that a prohibition on blinding could deter legitimate uses of lasers, it should not be difficult to distinguish between the use of nonweapon lasers for target designation and range-finding versus tactical laser weapons that can blind. During the Gulf War, there were many thousands of uses of nonweapon lasers by the United States and other nations, and only one or two known instances of eye damage.

In any event, this problem is certainly solvable, and is by no means unique to the laws of war. A prohibition should prohibit blinding as a method of warfare, as well as the development, production, transfer, and use of laser weapons the primary purpose or effect of which is to cause blindness.

Some violations would be difficult or impossible to prove, but that is true with other laws of war violations such as the deliberate targeting of civilians. The burden of proof is on the person alleging the violation.

As a strong proponent of limits on the use of landmines, I certainly do not want negotiations on laser weapons to

divert attention from the landmine issue. However, given the brevity of the Swedish proposal, its support among other governments and the unique opportunity presented by the Vienna conference, this is too important an opportunity to miss. I have urged the administration to delay the development or production of any antipersonnel laser system until the issue has been fully considered in Vienna.

Unfortunately, in June the Pentagon made an ill-advised decision to go forward with a limited production of 75 LCMS systems, while deferring a decision on full production of 2,500 units until early 1996. While I am relieved that a decision on full production was delayed, even limited production will complicate the negotiations on a prohibition. The administration should reverse this decision and postpone any further research, development, or procurement of tactical laser weapon systems until after the Vienna conference.

To its credit, the Pentagon recently announced that it has revised its policy on lasers, to prohibit the use of lasers specifically designed to cause permanent blindness. This is an important step, but it is not enough to prohibit only lasers designed to be used against personnel, since virtually any laser can be used to destroy eyesight if used for that purpose.

It is not too late to act to prevent the widespread proliferation of these weapons. Like exploding bullets and other weapons that have been banned as excessively cruel, the administration should actively support an international prohibition on blinding as a method of warfare. U.S. leadership, even at this late date, would virtually assure agreement.

Mr. President, again, the Vienna conference is a unique opportunity. On both landmines and laser weapons, U.S. leadership is urgently needed and vital to save lives and prevent the proliferation of these inhumane weapons.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS VOTES

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to explain several of my votes concerning H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations appropriation bill. I voted in favor of final passage of the bill because it would meet U.S. foreign relations and national security goals, while cutting spending in those areas that do not directly support the U.S. national security strategy.

Many of the amendments offered to the bill concerned the question of responsibility the United States has in economically or militarily supporting other countries. I ran for this body on a platform fiscal conservatism and directing our foreign assistance programs towards those areas in which the United States has a direct political, economic, or national security interest. Although many arguments were raised as to what effect U.S. aid would

or would not have in the recipient country, my votes on the amendments turned more on the question of whether the national security of the United States was directly improved by the provision or withholding of this assistance.

These principles led me to oppose the D'Amato amendment to cut Economic Support Fund assistance to Turkey, but support the Dole amendment on the transshipment of United States humanitarian aid. I believe the United States national security interests are best served by a strong and stable Turkish government, which has fully committed itself to the principles of open markets, democratic government, and the preservation of individual liberties.

Turkey, in my opinion, is making progress on all these fronts, and relations with its neighbors are similarly changing, both with United States assistance and through other venues. Because of the potential for our relations with Turkey to quickly shift, I believe it is critical any conditions the Congress places upon assistance to Turkey provide the Executive with the tools necessary to adjust to those new circumstances. The D'Amato amendment cut almost half of the Economic Support Fund aid to Turkey without any method for the Executive to resume that aid if such leverage proves necessary or fruitful. For that reason I was unable to support the D'Amato amendment.

The Dole amendment, however, provided such tools to the Executive, and I was therefore able to support this measure. Although the language of the amendment was universal in its application, the Majority Leader made clear his motivation for this measure was Turkey's refusal to allow the transshipment of United States humanitarian aid to Armenia. Because of the potential for a rapid shift in our national security objectives and relations with Turkey, this amendment provides the Executive the authority to waive its provisions if it is in the United States national security interests to do so. Given the strategic, political and economic importance of Turkey to the United States, I believe this is a vital provision. This language is even more expansive than the original Humanitarian Relief Corridor Act waiver language and I applaud its inclusion. Although the amendment was adopted by voice vote, if it had come to the floor for a roll call vote, I would have voted in favor of its adoption. I also wish to make it clear that if the progress I referred to earlier in the democratization and liberalization of Turkey does not continue and solidify, I may determine that requested levels of United States assistance are no longer serving our national interests.

I also wish to explain my opposition to the Brown amendment allowing the transfer of previously purchased military equipment to Pakistan. This amendment was presented as an at-

tempt to divest the United States of military equipment purchased by Pakistan, but withheld due to the implementation of the Pressler Amendment. I do not wish to argue the relative merits of the Pressler amendment itself, for that was not the issue. The issue was whether the United States should go back on its legislatively defined position that aid to Pakistan could only be provided if Pakistan did not possess a nuclear explosive device. The Pressler Amendment had been on the books for almost 5 years before it was finally implemented in 1990, and Pakistan knew full well what would happen if the President found it impossible to certify that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear explosive device. Pakistan continued those policies that led to this Presidential determination, and they must be willing to accept the consequences.

This is not to imply our interests in South Asia are static. All parties must abandon the notion that United States relations with Pakistan and India are part of some regional zero-sum game. Measures the United States undertakes to improve relations with one country should not be interpreted as happening at the expense of the other country. But I believe allowing the introduction of significant military hardware at this critical juncture in South Asian relations would be contrary to our national interests and regional stability. Obviously, however, the affirmative vote on the Brown amendment indicates the Senate is moving in another direction. I therefore believe it is now time for the United States to move past this issue in our relations with India and Pakistan, and extend our relations with both countries, not at the expense of one or the other, but in tandem.

As for my support for the Helms amendment regarding funding for the UN Population Fund [UNFPA], it is not because I am opposed to foreign assistance. Indeed, I believe it is vitally important we remain engaged in the international arena, and foreign assistance can be a powerful tool for the United States to further its political, economic, and national security goals. However, the history of our foreign assistance programs shows a repeated record of funding for controversial projects that do little to advance those goals. Given the demands to balance the budget and cut federal spending, I believe this program is extraneous to our foreign policy objectives.

The UNFPA fully supports Chinese population control programs that include forced abortions and involuntary sterilization. These practices are contrary to the values of a large segment of my State's citizens, and I believe the citizens of the United States as well. That consideration, in fact, is why the Congress has previously mandated such United assistance to the UNFPA be separated from the Chinese programs. But I believe such separations are irrelevant given the inherent fungibility of money. The UNFPA simply shifts other

donor countries contributions to China and use the United States contributions as a replacement in non-Chinese projects. The Helms amendment stops this elaborate shell game unless China ceases such practices or the UNFPA withdraws from this program, and brings such expenditures in line with the clear wishes of the American people. I therefore voted to adopt the Helms amendment.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to explain my vote regarding the Smith amendment prohibiting Most Favored Nation trading status with Vietnam, or the provision of trade financing incentives unless the President certifies they have been fully cooperative on the issues of United States POW/MIA's and human rights. The normalization of relations with Vietnam is a major development in United States foreign policy, and I have long been disappointed the Congress was not more fully brought into this process by the Administration. There are still substantial questions regarding the fate of United servicemen lost in South East Asia during the Vietnam War. I therefore voted for this amendment in the hope it would provide the leverage needed to obtain this crucial cooperation and information.

However, given the amendment's rejection by a vote of 39 to 59, it is clear the Senate has decided to move forward in relations with Vietnam, and I am fully prepared to become involved in that process. The Administration has promised these initiatives towards Vietnam will more assuredly provide the United States the answers it needs regarding POWs and MIA's in South East Asia. I will monitor that progress closely over the next year, and make an independent evaluation as to whether these measures have indeed helped resolve these questions.

Mr. President, it is difficult to analyze this myriad of issues in the pure vacuum of policy analysis. Different groups can have vastly different positions on issues, and each can defend those positions with a plethora of hard evidence and supporting statistics. However, by applying a standard of United national security interests to such decisions, I believe we can ensure that our international initiatives best meet our national strategies and goals, and further the establishment of democratic societies, free market economies and individual liberty.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### COSPONSORING S. 830

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor S. 830, a bill introduced by Senator SPECTER to amend the Federal Criminal Code to prohibit the making of false statements, misrepresentations or false writings to Congress or to any congressional committee or subcommittee. Until the Supreme Court decided *Hubbard versus United States* in May of this year, that